



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,491	07/29/2003	Michael R.S. Hill	9095DIV (2620/29)	7444
7590	03/22/2006			EXAMINER
Jeffrey J. Hohenshell 710 Medtronic Parkway Minneapolis, MN 55432				MULLEN, KRISTEN DROESCH
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3766	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/629,491	HILL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kristen Mullen	3766	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/22/05 (Response).  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 7/29/03 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, and 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Haim et al. (6,304,777) in view of Medtronic (WO 97/40885). Ben-Haim shows a system comprising a sensor comprising an electrical sensor comprising cardiac stimulation electrodes, an indicator, a stimulator in communication with the sensor, the stimulator comprises at least one cardiac stimulation electrode that is the same as the sensor electrodes; and a cardiac stimulator in communication with the sensor (Col. 5, line 61-Col. 6, line 3; Col. 8, lines 5-23; Fig. 1).

Although Ben-Haim shows a stimulator that inhibits beating of the heart, Ben-Haim teaches it is well known to stimulate the vagus nerve with an electrode to inhibit beating of the heart. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a nerve stimulator for the vagus nerve as Medtronic teaches for the stimulator of Ben-Haim, wherein so doing would amount to a mere substitution of one functional equivalent for another that would work equally well on the Ben-Haim device.

3. Claims 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Haim et al. (6,304,777) in view of Medtronic (WO 97/40885) as applied to claim 1 above. Ben-Haim is as explained before. Although Ben-Haim does not show a breathing regulator comprising a respirator or at least one nerve stimulation electrode, attention is directed to Medtronic which

Art Unit: 3766

teaches a similar device and uses electrodes to stimulate the phrenic nerve and a respirator in order to still the lungs during the medical procedure while the beating of the heart is inhibited (Page 9, lines 14-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to stop breathing using phrenic nerve stimulation and a respirator when the state of the cardiac tissue is a non-contracting state as Medtronic teaches in order to still the lungs during the medical procedure.

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Haim et al. (6,304,777) in view of Medtronic (WO 97/40885) as applied to claim 1 above. Ben-Haim is as explained before. Although Ben-Haim and Medtronic fail to specifically teach a drug delivery means, it is well known to utilize a drug delivery means such as a needle and syringe or a catheter during medical procedures in order to deliver anesthetics. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Ben-Haim and Medtronic to include a drug delivery means such as a needle and syringe or a catheter since it is well known well known to utilize such drug delivery means to deliver anesthetics during medical procedures.

The functional language and statements of intended use have been carefully considered but are not considered to impart any further structural limitations over the prior art. If applicant wishes to describe their apparatus by how it functions rather than what it is structurally, the examiner suggests utilizing means-plus-function language. If applicant wishes to describe their invention by how it is used, the examiner suggests utilizing a method claim.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristen Mullen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4944. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 10:30 am-6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert E. Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Robert E. Pezzuto  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3766

kdm